arXiv:hep-ph/9411215v1 3 Nov 1994

IP-ASTP-22-94

November, 1994

The $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi + \Lambda$ Decay Revisited

Hai-Yang Cheng and B. Tseng

Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica
Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China

Abstract

The $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ decay does not receive any nonspectator contributions and hence its theoretical calculation is relatively clean. Two different methods are employed for the study of $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$. In the first method, both b and s quarks are treated as heavy and leading $1/m_s$ as well as $1/m_b$ corrections are included. The branching ratio and the asymmetry parameter α are found to be $(0.7 - 1.5) \times 10^{-3}$ and 0.18, respectively. In the second method, only the b quark is treated as heavy. The prediction of the decay rate is very sensitive to the choice of the q^2 dependence for form factors. We obtain $\alpha = 0.31$ and $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-4}$ for dipole q^2 behavior as well as 8.2×10^{-4} for monopole q^2 dependence. We conclude that $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) \lesssim 10^{-3}$ and α is of order $0.20 \sim 0.30$ with a positive sign.

The $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ decay was originally reported by the UA1 Collaboration [1] with the result

$$F(\Lambda_b)\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = (1.8 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{1}$$

where $F(\Lambda_b)$ is the fraction of b quarks fragmenting into Λ_b. Assuming $F(\Lambda_b) = 10\%$ [1], this leads to

$$\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = (1.8 \pm 1.1)\%. \tag{2}$$

However, both CDF [2] and LEP [3] did not see any evidence for this decay. For example, based on the signal claimed by UA1, CDF should have reconstructed 30 ± 23 $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ events. Instead CDF found not more than 2 events and concluded that

$$F(\Lambda_b)\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) < 0.50 \times 10^{-3}. \tag{3}$$

The limit set by OPAL is [3]

$$F(\Lambda_b)\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) < 1.1 \times 10^{-3}. \tag{4}$$

Hence, a theoretical estimate of the branching ratio for this decay mode would be quite helpful to clarify the issue.

The exclusive two-body decays of the Λ_b is predominated by $\Lambda_b \to \Lambda_c^{(*)}\pi(\rho)$. However, the decay $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ is of particular interest from the theoretical point of view. At the quark level, the nonleptonic weak decays of the baryon usually receive contributions from external W-emission, internal W-emission and W-exchange diagrams. At the hadronic level, these contributions manifest as factorizable and pole diagrams. It is known that, contrary to the meson case, the nonspectator W-exchange effects in charmed baryon decays are of comparable importance as the spectator diagrams [4]. Unfortunately, in general it is difficult to estimate the pole diagrams. Nevertheless, there exist some decay modes of bottom baryons which proceed only through the internal or external W-emission diagram. Examples are

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{internal } W-\text{emission}: \quad \Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda, \quad \Xi_b \to J/\psi\Xi, \quad \Omega_b \to J/\psi\Omega, \\ &\text{external } W-\text{emission}: \quad \Omega_b \to \Omega_c\pi. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Consequently, the $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ decay is free of nonspectator effects and its theoretical calculation is relatively clean.

The $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ decay has been considered in Ref.[5] using the heavy s quark approach. The purpose of this short Letter is to update the analysis of Ref.[5] and furthermore present a quark-model estimate of its decay rate. Theoretical uncertainties are then addressed.

The general amplitude of $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ has the form

$$A(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = i\bar{u}_\Lambda(p_\Lambda)\varepsilon^{*\mu}[A_1\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 + A_2(p_\Lambda)_\mu\gamma_5 + B_1\gamma_\mu + B_2(p_\Lambda)_\mu]u_{\Lambda_b}(p_{\Lambda_b}). \tag{6}$$

Under factorization assumption, the internal W-emission contribution reads

$$A(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}V_{cb}V_{cs}^*a_2\langle J/\psi|\bar{c}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)c|0\rangle\langle\Lambda|\bar{s}\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)b|\Lambda_b\rangle, \tag{7}$$

where a_2 is an unknown parameter introduced in Ref.[6]. It follows from Eqs.(6) and (7) that

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= -\eta[g_1(m_{J/\psi}^2) + g_2(m_{J/\psi}^2)(m_{\Lambda_b} - m_\Lambda)], \\ A_2 &= -2\eta g_2(m_{J/\psi}^2), \\ B_1 &= \eta[f_1(m_{J/\psi}^2) - f_2(m_{J/\psi}^2)(m_{\Lambda_b} + m_\Lambda)], \\ B_2 &= 2\eta f_2(m_{J/\psi}^2), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

with $\eta = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}V_{cb}V_{cs}^*a_2 f_{J/\psi}m_{J/\psi}$, where f_i and g_i are the form factors defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\Lambda(p_\Lambda)|\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b|\Lambda_b(p_{\Lambda_b})\rangle = \; & \bar{u}_\Lambda[f_1(q^2)\gamma_\mu + if_2(q^2)\sigma_{\mu\nu}q^\nu + f_3(q^2)q_\mu \\ & -(g_1(q^2)\gamma_\mu + ig_2(q^2)\sigma_{\mu\nu}q^\nu + g_3(q^2)q_\mu)\gamma_5]u_{\Lambda_b}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $q = p_{\Lambda_b} - p_\Lambda$. Evidently, the main task is to compute the form factors.

In principle, one can apply the quark model to calculate the form factors f_i and g_i directly. However, the difficulty is that, as we shall see, the value of the form factors at $q^2 = m_{J/\psi}^2$ is very sensitive to the choice of their q^2 dependence. Instead we would like to appeal to the methods in which model dependence is kept to minimum. We will consider two different methods to estimate the rate of $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$. [1] In the first method, both b and s quarks are treated as heavy. Since the s quark mass in the baryon is only of order 500 MeV, it is important to estimate the $1/m_s$ corrections to see if it makes sense to apply heavy quark symmetry to the s quark at first place. In the second method, only the b quark is treated as heavy. Using the recent CLEO measurement for the form-factor ratio in $\Lambda_c - \Lambda$ transition, one can deduce the form-factor ratio in the $\Lambda_b - \Lambda$ matrix element.

In the heavy b-quark and s-quark limit, the form factors are simply given by $f_1 = g_1 = 1$ at zero recoil and $f_2 = g_2 = f_3 = g_3 = 0$ [8]. Following Ref.[9] to add the $1/m_s$ and $1/m_b$ corrections, we obtain [2]

$$f_1 = g_1 = \left[1 + \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{2m_s}\frac{1}{1+\omega}\left(\omega - \frac{m_\Lambda}{m_{\Lambda_b}}\right) + \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{2m_b}\frac{1}{1+\omega}\left(\omega - \frac{m_{\Lambda_b}}{m_\Lambda}\right)\right]h,$$

---

[1] These two methods were already elaborated on in Ref.[7] for the $\Lambda_b \to \Lambda\gamma$ decay.

[2] The $(1 - m_\Lambda/m_{\Lambda_b})$ term in Eq.(27) of Ref.[5] should read $(\omega - m_\Lambda/m_{\Lambda_b})$. Contrary to some claims made in the literature, it is not necessary to introduce a Clebsch-Gordon coefficient $1/\sqrt{3}$ in Eq.(10).

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_2 = g_3 &= -\frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{2(1+\omega)}\left(\frac{1}{m_s m_{\Lambda_b}} + \frac{1}{m_b m_\Lambda}\right) h, \\
f_3 = g_2 &= -\frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{2(1+\omega)}\left(\frac{1}{m_s m_{\Lambda_b}} - \frac{1}{m_b m_\Lambda}\right) h,
\end{aligned} \tag{10}
$$

with $\omega \equiv v_{\Lambda_b} \cdot v_\Lambda = 1.86$, $\bar{\Lambda} = m_{\Lambda_b} - m_b = m_{\Lambda_c} - m_c = m_\Lambda - m_s \approx 700$ MeV, and

$$
h = \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)}\right)^{-6/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_c)}{\alpha_s(m_s)}\right)^{-6/27} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_s)}{\alpha_s(\mu)}\right)^{a_L(\omega)} \zeta(\omega,\mu), \tag{11}
$$

where $\zeta(\omega)$ is a universal baryonic Isgur-Wise function normalized to unity at zero recoil or $v_{\Lambda_b} \cdot v_\Lambda = 1$, and the expression for $a_L(\omega)$ can be found in Ref.[10]. As in Ref.[5] we choose the normalization scale $\mu \sim m_s$ so that $\alpha_s(\mu) \sim 1$ and $h \simeq 1.23\,\zeta(\omega,\mu)$. We see from Eq.(10) that the $1/m_s$ correction to the $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ amplitude is quite sizeable, about 40% for $m_s = 500$ MeV. Therefore, higher order $1/m_s$ corrections should be included for a realistic comparsion with experiment. In practice, however, it is impossible to carry out this formidable task in terms of the present technique.

In order to estimate the $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ rate, we employ two recent models for $\zeta(\omega)$:

$$
\zeta(\omega) = \begin{cases} 0.99\exp[-1.3(\omega-1)], & \text{soliton model [11];} \\ \left(\frac{2}{\omega+1}\right)^{3.5+\frac{1.2}{\omega}}, & \text{MIT bag model [12].} \end{cases} \tag{12}
$$

Hence, $\zeta(\omega = 1.86)$ ranges from 0.23 to 0.32. The decay rate is given by [13]

$$
\Gamma(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = \frac{1}{8\pi}\,\frac{E_{J/\psi} + m_{J/\psi}}{m_{\Lambda_b}}\,p_c \left[2(|S|^2 + |P_2|^2) + \frac{E_{J/\psi}^2}{m_{J/\psi}^2}(|S+D|^2 + |P_1|^2)\right], \tag{13}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
S &= -A_1, \\
D &= \frac{p_c^2}{E_{J/\psi}(E_\Lambda + m_\Lambda)}\,(A_1 - m_{\Lambda_b} A_2), \\
P_1 &= -\frac{p_c}{E_{J/\psi}}\left(\frac{m_{\Lambda_b} + m_\Lambda}{E_\Lambda + m_\Lambda} B_1 + m_{\Lambda_b} B_2\right), \\
P_2 &= \frac{p_c}{E_\Lambda + m_\Lambda} B_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{14}
$$

where p_c is the c.m. momentum. Using $|V_{cb}| = 0.040$ [14], $\tau(\Lambda_b) = 1.07 \times 10^{-12}s$ [15], $a_2 \sim 0.23$, [3] and $f_{J/\psi} = 395\,\text{MeV}$ extracted from the observed $J/\psi \to e^+e^-$ rate, $\Gamma(J/\psi \to e^+e^-) = (5.27 \pm 0.37)$ keV [15], we find

$$
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = 1.42 \times 10^{-2}|\zeta(\omega)|^2 = (0.7 - 1.5) \times 10^{-3}. \tag{15}
$$

---

[3] The parameter a_2 is extracted from $B \to \psi K(K^*)$ and $B \to D(D^*)\pi(\rho)$ decays to be 0.227 ± 0.013 and 0.23 ± 0.06 respectively [16].

When the longitudinal polarization of the Λ is measured or anisotropy in angular distribution is produced in a polarized Λ_b decay, it is governed by the asymmetry parameter α given by [13]

$$\alpha = \frac{4m^2_{J/\psi}\mathrm{Re}(S^*P_2) + 2E^2_{J/\psi}\mathrm{Re}(S+D)^*P_1}{2(|S|^2+|P_2|^2)m^2_{J/\psi} + (|S+D|^2+|P_1|^2)E^2_{J/\psi}}. \tag{16}$$

Numerically, it reads

$$\alpha(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = \, 0.18\,. \tag{17}$$

The above prediction for the branching ratio is smaller than our previous estimate 4.6×10^{-3} [5] due to the decrease of (i) the baryonic Isgur-Wise function $\zeta(\omega)$ from 0.53 to 0.23-0.32, (ii) the lifetime $\tau(\Lambda_b)$ from $1.34 \times 10^{-12}s$ to $1.07 \times 10^{-12}s$, and (iii) $|V_{cb}|$ from 0.044 to 0.040. On the other hand, f_1 and g_1 are increased by 20% owing to the replacement of $(1 - m_\Lambda/m_{\Lambda_b})$ by $(\omega - m_\Lambda/m_{\Lambda_b})$ [see the footnote #2 right before Eq.(10)]. The net result is a decrease of the branching ratio for $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$.

We next turn to the second method in which only the b quark is treated as heavy. Since this method is already elucidated in Ref.[7], we will recapitulate it here. In the heavy b-qaurk limit, there are only two independent form factors F_1 and F_2 [17]:

$$\langle\Lambda(p)|\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b|\Lambda_b(v)\rangle = \, \bar{u}_{_\Lambda}\left(F_1^{\Lambda_b\Lambda}(v\cdot p) + \not{v}F_2^{\Lambda_b\Lambda}(v\cdot p)\right)\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)u_{_{\Lambda_b}}, \tag{18}$$

which are related to the standard form factors by

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(q^2) &= g_1(q^2) = F_1(q^2) + \frac{m_\Lambda}{m_{\Lambda_b}}F_2(q^2), \\ f_2(q^2) &= g_2(q^2) = f_3(q^2) = g_3(q^2) = \, \frac{1}{m_{\Lambda_b}}F_2(q^2). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Form factors f_i and g_i can be calculated in the quark model (e.g. the non-relativistic quark model and the MIT bag model) by first evaluating them at zero recoil, where the use of the quark model is supposed to be most trustworthy, and then extrapolating them to the desired q^2 under some assumption on their q^2 dependence [18]. We now try to reduce the model dependence by considering the form-factor ratio $R \equiv F_2/F_1$. Note that the same ratio for $\Lambda_c \to \Lambda$ transition has been measured recently by CLEO to be [19]

$$R_{\Lambda_c\Lambda} = -0.33 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.15\,. \tag{20}$$

In the heavy quark limit, $R_{\Lambda_b\Lambda}$ is identical to $R_{\Lambda_c\Lambda}$ at the same heavy quark velocity. At zero recoil or $q^2 = q^2_m \equiv (m_{\Lambda_b} - m_\Lambda)^2$, f_1 is reduced to the usual vector coupling constant, which is found to be 0.95 in the MIT bag model [7]. [4] Substituting this and $R_{\Lambda_b\Lambda}$ into (19) leads to

$$g_1(q_m^2) = f_1(q_m^2) = 0.95\,, \quad g_2(q_m^2) = f_2(q_m^2) = -0.060\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}, \tag{21}$$

where only the central values are used for f_2 and g_2. The q^2 dependence for form factors is usually parametrized as

$$f(q^2) = \, f(q_m^2)\left(\frac{1-q_m^2/m_*^2}{1-q^2/m_*^2}\right)^n \equiv f(q_m^2)\hat{\zeta}(q^2), \tag{22}$$

where m_* is a pole mass and $\hat{\zeta}(q^2)$ plays the same role as the Isgur-Wise function $\zeta(v\cdot v')$. In practice we will take $n = 1, 2$, corresponding to monopole and dipole behavior, respectively. Taking $m_* = 5.42$ GeV, [5] we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) &= 4.0\times 10^{-3}\left|\hat{\zeta}(m_{J/\psi}^2)\right|^2 \\ &= \begin{cases} 1.6\times 10^{-4} & \text{dipole;} \\ 8.2\times 10^{-4} & \text{monopole,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

and

$$\alpha(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) = \, 0.31\,. \tag{24}$$

We see that the branching ratio is very sensitive to the choice of form-factor q^2 dependence.

To summarize, two different methods have been employed to study the $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda$ decay. The first method is model independent, but it is subject to possible large higher order $1/m_s$ corrections. The second method takes into account m_s effects to all orders, but the sensitivity on the choice of form-factor q^2 behavior renders it impossible to make definite predictions. Nevertheless, we can conclude that $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to J/\psi\Lambda) \lesssim 10^{-3}$ and α is of order $0.20 \sim 0.30$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported in part by the National Science of Council of ROC under Contract No. NSC84-2112-M-001-014.

---

[4] The form factor g_1 is essentially reduced to the axial vector coupling constant. We found $g_1(q_m^2) = 0.86$ in the bag model. In the heavy quark effective theory, the difference between f_i and g_i arises from $1/m_b$ corrections.

[5] This is the mass of $B_s^*(1^-)$. The pole mass m_* is the same for f_i and g_i in the heavy quark limit.

REFERENCES

1. UA1 Collaboration, C. Albarjar *et al., Phys. Lett.* **B273**, 540 (1991).
2. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al., Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 2639 (1993).
3. S.E. Tzmarias, invited talk presented in the 27th International Conference on High Energy Physics, Glasgow, July 20-27, 1994.
4. See e.g. H.Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, *Phys. Rev.* **D46**, 1042 (1992); *ibid* **D48**, 4188 (1993).
5. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Lett.* **B289**, 455 (1992).
6. M. Bauer, B. Stech, and M. Wirbel, *Z. Phys.* **C34**, 103 (1987).
7. H.Y. Cheng, C.Y. Cheung, G.L. Lin, Y.C. Lin, T.M. Yan, and H.L. Yu, CLNS 94/1278 (1994).
8. N. Isgur and M. Wise, *Phys. Lett.* **B232**, 113 (1989); **B237**, 527 (1990).
9. H. Georgi, B. Grinstein, and M.B. Wise, *Phys. Lett.* **B252**, 456 (1990).
10. A. Falk *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B343**, 1 (1990).
11. E. Jenkins, A. Manohar, and M.B. Wise, *Nucl. Phys.* **B396**, 38 (1993).
12. M. Sadzikowski and K. Zalewski, *Z. Phys.* **C59**, 677 (1993).
13. See e.g. S. Pakvasa, S.F. Tuan, and S.P. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 3746 (1994).
14. M. Neubert, *Phys. Lett.* **B338**, 84 (1994).
15. Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 1173 (1994).
16. H.Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, IP-ASTP-21-94 (1994).
17. T. Mannel, W. Roberts, and Z. Ryzak, *Nucl. Phys.* **B355**, 38 (1991); *Phys. Lett.* **B255**, 593 (1991); F. Hussain, J.G. Körner, M. Krämer, and G. Thompson, *Z. Phys.* **C51**, 321 (1991).
18. R. Pérez-Marcial, R. Huerta, A. Garcia, and M. Avila-Aoki, *Phys. Rev.* **D40**, 2955 (1989).
19. CLEO Collaboration, J. Dominick *et al.,* CLEO CONF 94-19 (1994).